

FOUR SHORT NOTES ON THE BISUTUN TEXT AND MONUMENT

BY
W. VOGELSANG

1. The Margian 'rebel leader', *Frâda*
2. The nine 'rebel leaders' and nineteen battles of Darius
3. The so-called 'Rangaufstieg' of *Mâda*
4. The unit of *Gandâra-Saka*/the *Sakâ*

1. *The Margian 'rebel leader'*¹, *Frâda*², A large part of the mostly trilingual Bisutun inscription³ is taken up by a report concerning, firstly, the events which led up to the accession of the Achaemenid king Darius (r. 522-486 B.C.) to the Persian throne, and secondly, the suppression of many of the revolts which, at the same time, broke out in various parts of the Empire (Old Persian version, paragraphs 10-51; Elamite and Akkadian versions, sections 10-40). At the end of this long report, Darius proudly proclaims that he accomplished all those deeds within one year of becoming king (paragraph 52; section 41. See also paragraphs 56; 57; 59; 62, or sections 45; 46; 48; 50).

* At this point I would like to acknowledge the friendly advice of Prof. Dr. P. Calmeyer, who made a number of useful comments concerning the nature of this article. Although we still disagree on several points, especially as regards sections 3 and 4, his help was invaluable.

¹ All references to the 'rebel leaders', who were the opponents of Darius during the first few years of his reign, are put between inverted comma's, in order to indicate the still questionable role of Darius, and the consequent problem as regards the nature of his adversaries.

² Throughout this study, the Old Persian rendering of the various names is adopted, usually following Kent (1953).

³ For the Old Persian version of the DB text, I refer the reader to Kent (1953). A recent, annotated translation is by Borger and Hinz (1984). For the Elamite version, see Weissbach (1911) and Hinz (1974). An edition and translation of the Akkadian version is by Von Voigtlander (1978). An edition and translation of the (only partly preserved) Aramaic text, not represented at Bisutun, was published by Greenfield and Porten (1982).

In addition, he recapitulates that he has captured nine 'rebel kings' and fought nineteen battles. In the same paragraph/section, he repeats the names of the nine 'rebels'. The sequence in which these men are enumerated follows the order in which their revolts and arrests are discussed in the preceding text. These discussions normally include an indication (following the Babylonian calendar) of the day and month in which the main battles were fought⁴. The 'one year' of Darius has been calculated as covering part of his accession year (from March 27, 522 B.C., to April 13, 521 B.C.) plus part of his first full regnal year (from April 14, 521 B.C., to April 2, 520 B.C.). On the Babylonian calendar, the accession year of Darius includes an intercalated month, and is consequently eighteen days longer than normal. The dates of the main battles make it clear that the text, when reporting the main events, does not follow a strictly chronological order. Neither, however, are we to assume that the sequence is strictly geographical. Instead, it appears that the text is split into two (perhaps three) main sections⁵: the first part (paragraphs 10-34; sections 10-27) relates the events in which Darius was closely involved, namely the defeat of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis and Darius' successful attempt to hold the hub of the Empire, Media-Mesopotamia, against his opponents; the second part (paragraphs 35-51; sections 28-40) gives an account of a series of separate events which took place in other areas, which for the greater part lay outside the immediate reach of Darius. A possible, separate, third part (paragraphs 49-51; sections 39-40) consists of the report on the suppression, at the orders of Darius, of a revolt in Mesopotamia. This report concludes the series of accounts on Darius' one year as listed in the text. The revolt in Mesopotamia clearly started in the latter half of Darius' 'one year', and its place in the text is no doubt based on chronological considerations; this fact alone differentiates this particular account from the preceding reports which are placed in a non-chronological order. The special character of the third(?) part (however, see below) has been indicated by various scholars (e.g. Shahbazi 1972:612 and Nagel 1983:178); it alone seems to vindicate the widely held view that the defeat of the 'rebel'

⁴ For relevant literature, see Poebel (1938a and b; 1939) and Parker and Dubberstein (1956).

⁵ The division as suggested by Nagel (1983:178 ff.) seems rather artificial, and is not very helpful.

Arakha in Mesopotamia was not the last event of the 'one year', but preceded the fall of the Margian 'rebel', *Frâda*. We will come back to this point later in this discussion.

A problem arises when an attempt is made to fit all the events into one year. The period which elapsed between the fall of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis (strictly speaking the first 'rebel leader' who is discussed in the text, see section 2) and the defeat of *Arakha* in Mesopotamia (which is the last of the 'one year' events to be reported, see above) has been calculated as approximately one year and twelve weeks (or, according to the Babylonian calendar, one year and six weeks). One may wonder whether this is not sufficiently close to the 'one year' mentioned so emphatically by Darius, especially when it is realised that the 'one year' may be a cultural, or at least a deliberate literary device (compare the 'one year' of the kings, mentioned in Urartaeon texts, see Van Loon 1966:9). However, many scholars have refused to accept this apparent vagueness on the part of Darius (see section 2). Many advocated that the 'one year', if it started with the fall of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis (dated to the tenth day of the seventh month, which on the Julian calendar equals September 29, 522 B.C.), must have lasted even longer. Strategic considerations were brought forward to indicate that the defeat of the Margian 'rebel leader' *Frâda*, in the text dated to the twenty-third day of the ninth month, should not be placed in the accession year of Darius (which would give it the date of December 10, 522 B.C.), but in the first full regnal year of the king (thus giving it a date of December 28, 521 B.C.). These suggestions were based on the idea that the revolt of the Margians, followed by Darius' orders to his satrap in Bactria to suppress the revolt, and by the actual suppression itself, could never have occurred during the short time which elapsed since the fall of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis on September 29 of the same year, while Darius was still in Media, especially as Darius fought his first battle in Mesopotamia on December 13, and he includes *Margush* among the *dahyâva* which raised in revolt while he was in Mesopotamia (paragraph 20; section 21)⁶. However, these factors are far from conclusive; it should

⁶ The 'rebellious' *dahyâva* are enumerated as follows: *Pârsa*, *Ûvja*, *Mâda*, *Athurâ*, (*Mudrâya*, *Par*)*thava*, *Margush*, *Thatagush*, *Saka*. As will be seen in sections 3 and 4, this sequence seems to follow the usual pattern of the Achaemenid 'provincial lists'.

be realised that in the far southeast of the Empire, in the *dahyâva* of *Haraувatish* and *Thatagush* (Classical Arachosia and Sattagydia), the satrap of Arachosia, loyal to Darius and, according to the text, at the king's command, had to fight against 'rebel' troupes despatched from *Pârsa*, and the first of these battles is dated to December 29, 522 B.C. The question remains whether the 'loyal' satraps in Bactria and Arachosia were really acting on the commands of Darius; in any case, the 'strategic' argument seems unconvincing. Yet, the advocates of the later date for the defeat of *Frâda* received some support from another source. This point is the main subject of this short note.

I would like to draw attention to the line of nine (ten, if we include the later added Scythian leader *Skunkha*⁷) 'rebel leaders' of the 'one year', who are depicted in front of the victorious Darius on the Bisutun relief. They are not ordered in the same sequence as in the text; the most important difference, in the present context, is the position of *Frâda* who is placed almost at the end, but before *Skunkha*. Some scholars have suggested that the depiction of *Frâda* did not form part of the original lay-out of the relief, but was added at a later date⁸. This hypothesis does not seem to be supported by the actual build-up of the relief, and should therefore be discarded. The first nine rebels were carved following the same plan; only *Skunkha* was added at a later date, as can be clearly detected from the monument itself⁹. Below we will compare the two sequences. In doing so, we will also indicate the basic division of the report, as discussed above. It should, at this point, be stressed that *Gaumâta*/Smerdis, as depicted on the relief, is lying on the ground, beneath the feet of Darius, while the other 'rebels'

in which the lands of the centre of the Empire are mentioned first, followed by the other *dahyâva*, which are ordered along four radiating lines stretching from the centre to the four corners of the realm. As usual in the early lists, the lands of the west precede those of the east.

⁷ The tenth 'rebel leader', *Skunkha*, was added when the Elamite text to the right of the relief was already inscribed. The depiction of *Skunkha* took the place of the first column of the Elamite text. A copy of this version was subsequently placed to the left of the Old Persian version, underneath the Akkadian text (see Trümpelmann 1967:291 ff.).

⁸ See Dandamajev (1976:62 ff.) and Nagel (1983). This hypothesis seems adequately refuted by Borger (1982:121-122, note 24).

⁹ See note 7. See also Luschey (1968:779-80), who points out some stylistic differences between *Skunkha* and the other 'rebels'.

stand in front of the king, with the hands bound behind their backs. We will also give the date (following the Babylonian and Julian calendar) of the decisive battles, as far as they are reported in the text. For a list, with dates, of all the main battles, I refer the reader to section 2.

Text	Dates of decisive battles	Relief
1. <i>Gaumâta</i>	VII,10 (29-9-522)	1. <i>Gaumâta</i>
2. <i>Âçina</i>	no battle recorded	2. <i>Âçina</i>
3. <i>Nidintu-Bel</i>	X,2 (18-12-522)	3. <i>Nidintu-Bel</i>
4. <i>Martiya</i>	no battle recorded	4. <i>Fravartish</i>
5. <i>Fravartish</i>	I,25 (8-5-521)	5. <i>Martiya</i>
6. <i>Ciçantakhma</i>	VII,5 (12-10-521) ¹⁰	6. <i>Ciçantakhma</i>
7. <i>Frâda</i>	IX,23 (10-12-522)	7. <i>Vahyazdâta</i>
8. <i>Vahyazdâta</i>	IV,5 (15-7-521)	8. <i>Arakha</i>
9. <i>Arakha</i>	VIII,22 (27-11-521)	9. <i>Frâda</i>
		10. <i>Skunkha</i>

The differing sequence of the relief is often considered to be based on chronological criteria¹¹. It should be added, that the date of the final battle against *Ciçantakhma*, which clearly contradicts a chronological arrangement, has only become known since the publication of the Akkadian version of the Bisutun text (Von Voigtlander 1978); yet, in two recent publications some doubt is cast upon the correct reading by Von Voigtlander of this particular passage, and an alternative date of IV,5 (July 15, 521 B.C.) has been suggested¹². Whether or not these doubts, and the alternative reading, are justified, remains debatable. However, it should be stated that there are two more points which seem to refute the hypothesis of a chronological ordering of the 'rebel leaders' on the relief. In the first place, it should be pointed out that the changing positions of *Martiya* and *Fravartish* are of some significance. It can

¹⁰ See section 2.

¹¹ See e.g. Herzfeld (in Sarre/Herzfeld 1910:197); Poebel (1938b); Junge (1944:182, note 23); Dandamajev (1976: 58 ff.); Borger (1982); Cook (1983: 56). Hallock (1960: 38) refers to Poebel. A chronological order is inferred by Hinz (1938:148; 1976:160); see also Borger and Hinz (1984:437; 443). A chronological order is refuted by Olmstead (1948:110ff.); Kent (1953:162, note 3) and Shahbazi (1972). Nagel (1983:179) also refuses to accept the chronological ordering.

¹² See Borger (1982:126-127) and Borger and Hinz (1984:435). We are not in the position to comment upon the various readings; however, it may be possible that the two eminent German scholars were biased by their emphasis on the chronological ordering of the relief.

hardly be maintained that the 'rebel' *Martiya* in Elam was captured after the defeat of the Mede *Fravartish*; yet, on the relief, *Martiya* follows *Fravartish*. The second point we want to refer to is the position of the Margian 'rebel' *Frâda*. Many scholars, advocating the chronological arrangement of the relief, have explained the place of *Frâda* on the relief by suggesting that his defeat marked the last event of the 'one year', and should therefore have occurred during the ninth month of the second, rather than of the first year of Darius' reign¹³. The acceptance of this hypothesis has caused a problem as regards the veracity of Darius' words, when he states that all the reported events took place within one year. To solve this problem, many hypotheses have been put forward (see section 2). However, it seems that the complete acceptance, by many scholars, of the hypothesis that the captured 'rebel leaders' on the relief are depicted chronologically, has stood in the way of an alternative interpretation of the difference between the two sequences, and as a consequence has obscured the issue of the 'one year' of Darius.

An alternative interpretation of the sequence on the relief may be explored by studying the visual appearance of the depicted 'rebels'¹⁴. We notice that the prisoners wear a particular type of costume, which seems to link these men to their place of origin. Among the nine 'rebels' of Darius' 'one year', we may differentiate between basically three types of dress, namely the Persian/Elamite garb (P/E), with long, flowing garments and low shoes; the short tunic with short sleeves of the Mesopotamians (Mes), and finally the Median costume (Med), with tunic and the characteristic, combined trouser-boots/socks. While bearing in mind these differences between the costumes, we will observe that the captives are ordered so that no two identical costume types follow each other. A similar alternation of costume can be observed on other Achaemenid monuments, e.g. on the Apadana at Persepolis¹⁵. Below

¹³ Apart from the advocates of the chronological ordering of the relief, we should also refer to Weissbach (1911:45) and Hallock (1960).

¹⁴ For a discussion of the relief, with excellent photographs, I refer the reader to Luschey (1968).

¹⁵ Compare e.g. the ushers in alternating Persian/Elamite and Median garbs, who lead the delegations, as depicted on the Apadana façade. See also Calmeyer (1982:139 ff., esp. 146 f.).

we will compare the two sequences, this time with an indication of the costume type worn by the captives.

Text	Relief
1. <i>Gaumâta</i> (P/E)	1. <i>Gaumâta</i> (P/E)
2. <i>Âçina</i> (P/E)	2. <i>Âçina</i> (P/E)
3. <i>Nidintu-Bel</i> (Mes)	3. <i>Nidintu-Bel</i> (Mes)
4. <i>Martiya</i> (P/E)	4. <i>Fravartish</i> (Med)
5. <i>Fravartish</i> (Med)	5. <i>Martiya</i> (P/E)
6. <i>Ciçantakhma</i> (Med)	6. <i>Ciçantakhma</i> (Med)
7. <i>Frâda</i> (P/E) ¹⁶	7. <i>Vahyazdâta</i> (P/E)
8. <i>Vahyazdâta</i> (P/E)	8. <i>Arakha</i> (Mes)
9. <i>Arakha</i> (Mes)	9. <i>Frâda</i> (P/E)
	10. <i>Skunkha</i>

The above comparison shows that the basic ordering of the ‘rebels’ (first those who were dealt with by Darius, either personally or at his direct orders, and in the second place those ‘revolts’ which were quenched with a minimum of direct interference from Darius), as followed in the text, is not seriously altered on the relief; the two changes (as regards *Martiya*/*Fravartish* and *Frâda*) fall within each of the two main sections (which may point out that the *Arakha* episode should be included in the second sub-division, see above), and seem to be based on visual, and possibly aesthetic considerations, in order to achieve the desired alternation of types of costume, as worn by the captives. Consequently, one of the reasons to date the fall of *Frâda* to the second year of Darius seems to have vanished.

2. *The nine ‘rebel leaders’ and nineteen battles of Darius.* In paragraph 52/section 41, at the end of his long report concerning the revolts in the

¹⁶ Luschey (1968:75; 79) does not seem to have recognised the Persian/Elamite style of *Frâda*’s dress. Instead, he suggests that the garment of *Frâda* should be related to the *Kandys* which is worn by the leader of Delegation IV on the Apadana at Persepolis. This suggestion cannot be accepted; see Nagel (1982: 172 ff.). However, Nagel’s further suggestions as to the identity of *Frâda* and *Skunkha* are unacceptable, and need no further discussion. It should be noted that *Frâda* seems to be wearing the Persian/Elamite overgarment, but not the shoes which seem to go with that particular costume. Instead *Frâda* appears to be wearing boots (see Luschey 1968:76, and Calmeyer 1972-1976:472). This latter point links *Frâda* to the Eastern Iranian peoples, compare the delegates from *Haraiva*, *Zranka* and *Harauvatish*, as depicted on the royal tombs (see Schmidt 1970: Fig. 42).

Empire, Darius states that he has captured nine 'rebel kings' and fought nineteen battles, all within one year after he had become king. However, calculations as regards the actual length of time, based on information which is given in the text, have shown that, using the Babylonian calendar, a period of one year and six weeks elapsed between the fall of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis in Media and the defeat of *Arakha* in Mesopotamia (see above, section 1). If one accepts that the arrest of *Frâda* is chronologically the last event of the 'one year', the period of time which passed after the death of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis is even longer. Many scholars have not accepted this inexactitude, and various explanations have been put forward. A. Poebel (1938b; 1939) suggested that the fall of *Arakha* should not be included in the 'one year' (esp. 1938b:312f.). To Poebel, the 'one year' of Darius only lasted nine months. He also hypothesised that *Frâda* was defeated in the accession year of Darius, but was captured one year later (1938b:300ff.; 313); in this way Poebel could adhere to his conviction that the captives on the relief were depicted in a chronological order. The chronological order of the relief and the disappearance of *Frâda* were also accepted by Dandamajev (1976:58 ff.). Also W. Hinz, in an early study (1938), adopted the idea of *Frâda*'s 'disappearance', but he did not agree with Poebel as regards *Arakha*. In this way, Hinz was left with a period of one year and two and a half months (or, one Babylonian year and one and a half month). In a later study however (1942), Hinz suggested that the fall of *Gaumâta* should not be included in the counting of the events which took place in the 'one year', because it was said by Darius that the events occurred within one year after he had become king¹⁷. Hinz argued that Darius only became king following his victory over *Gaumâta*. A further step was taken by Hallock (1960). He remarked that Hinz's hypothesis as regards the exclusion of *Gaumâta* from the 'one year' events actually meant that there was no necessity to suggest that *Frâda* escaped captivity for a long time after his defeat by Darius' forces. Hallock then defends the old hypothesis (see Weissbach) that *Frâda*'s defeat cannot have taken place so soon after Darius' victory over *Gaumâta*, and should therefore be dated to the second year; in this context, Hallock refers to the sequence of the prisoners as depicted on the relief. As Hallock considered the defeat of the Elamite 'rebel' *Âçina* as insignificant, he took the first battle

¹⁷ Hinz's proposals as regards *Gaumâta*/Smerdis were also accepted by Shahbazi (1972).

against *Nidintu-Bel* as the first event of the 'one year'. Hallock ended with the conclusion that the 'one year' of Darius lasted one year minus three days. Hallock's proposals were partly followed by Hinz (1976:160), who suggested that the defeat of *Âçina* must have occurred exactly one year before the last event of the 'one year' (according to Hinz, the death of *Frâda* on December 28, 521 B.C.), which would have been on December 10, 522 B.C. (see also Trümpelmann 1976:296). One problem remained: the number of battles. Darius explicitly mentioned the number of nineteen battles. These nineteen can easily be identified with the major battles of which the date is given in the text. However, if one excludes the final battle against *Gaumâta*, as done by Hinz and others, there are only eighteen major battles left. In order to find the 'missing' battle, various hypotheses have been put forward. A. Sh. Shahbazi (1972) included the arrest of *Âçina*; yet, this event does not receive much prominence in the text, and no date is given. Its inclusion into the list of nineteen battles therefore seems doubtful. Borger (1982:130) refers to the Aramaic text, in which he reads that the final defeat of *Vahyazdâta*'s general in Arachosia against Darius' loyal satrap *Vivâna*, which in the other three versions is only cursorily mentioned, is called a 'battle'. However, a new reading by Greenfield and Porten (1982:45) does not follow Borger's suggestion. Anyhow, again no date is mentioned¹⁸.

In this short note I would like to question Hinz's proposals as regards the exclusion of the defeat of *Gaumâta* from the list of nineteen battles. In order to do so, I refer again to the three points which Darius emphasises at the end of his report: he captured nine 'rebel leaders'; he fought nineteen battles, and he accomplished all that within one year after that he became king. Concerning the nine 'rebels', their names are recapitulated in paragraph 52/section 41, and the list is headed by *Gaumâta*/Smerdis. The same nine men are depicted on the relief, and *Gaumâta*/Smerdis is shown in the forefront of the group. Therefore, as far as the first statement of Darius is concerned, there is no reason to exclude *Gaumâta*/Smerdis; who else would be the ninth 'rebel'? The second point, the nineteen battles, has been hotly debated

¹⁸ The same event was also brought forward by Hinz (1942:329) as one of the nineteen battles of Darius' 'one year'.

for many years (see above). Yet, if we accept that the first of these battles was fought against *Gaumâta*/Smerdis, no problems remain: the number nineteen reflects those battles which are explicitly mentioned as such in the text, with an indication of their dates. It appears as if the author(s) of the Bisutun text came to this number by simply counting the battles which were reported previously. Below we will give a list of these nineteen battles, following the order in which they are mentioned in the text. The dates are those given in the text, and these have been transposed into the Julian calendar:

Battles, clearly mentioned as such in the text

1. Against <i>Gaumâta</i>	VII,10	September 29, 522 B.C.
2. Against <i>Nidintu-Bel</i>	IX,26	December 13, 522 B.C.
3. Against <i>Nidintu-Bel</i>	X,2	December 18, 522 B.C.
4. Against <i>Fravartish</i>	X,27	January 12, 521 B.C.
5. Against (<i>Armina</i>)	II,8	May 20, 521 B.C.
6. Against (<i>Armina</i>)	II,18	May 30, 521 B.C.
7. Against (<i>Armina</i>)	III,9	June 20, 521 B.C.
8. Against (<i>Armina</i>)	X,15	December 31, 522 B.C.
9. Against (<i>Armina</i>)	II,30	June 11, 521 B.C.
10. Against <i>Fravartish</i>	I,25	May 8, 521 B.C.
11. Against <i>Çiçantakhma</i>	VII,5	October 12, 521 B.C. ¹⁹
12. Against (<i>Parthava</i>)	XII,22	March 8, 521 B.C.
13. Against (<i>Parthava</i>)	IV,1	July 11, 521 B.C.
14. Against <i>Frâda</i>	IX,23	December 10, 522 B.C.
15. Against <i>Vahyazdâta</i>	II,12	May 24, 521 B.C.
16. Against <i>Vahyazdâta</i>	IV,5	July 15, 521 B.C.
17. Against (<i>Harauvatish</i>)	X,13	December 29, 522 B.C.
18. Against (<i>Harauvatish</i>)	XII,7	February 21, 521 B.C.
19. Against <i>Arakha</i>	VIII,22	November 27, 521 B.C.

The short discussion above seems to indicate that the fall of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis should not be excluded from a survey of the 'one year'. We may continue by saying that it would even have been unwise of Darius to ignore the event. In order to support his own legitimacy, Darius had to be very explicit about the 'true' character of the 'usurper' *Gaumâta*/Smerdis. If Darius could not convince the people that his opponent was the first in a series of 'rebels', rather than the legitimate king, he could be accused of being yet another illegitimate pretender to the Achaemenid throne. In this light we may try to explain the two statements by Darius at the commencement and the conclusion of the *Gaumâta*/Smerdis episode (paragraphs 10 and 15/Elamite sections 10 and 14): "This is what I

¹⁹ This date is only reported in the Akkadian version of the DB text; see also section 1.

did (have done) after that I became (had become) king”²⁰. These statements appear to indicate that Darius tried to emphasise that he did not date his kingship to the fall of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis, but that he already was the legitimate Achaemenid king before the ‘usurper’ was defeated.

In conclusion, I would like to propose that the ‘one year’ of Darius stretched from the first event, the fall of *Gaumâta*/Smerdis, to the last episode, the defeat of *Arakha*. The two decisive battles which mark the beginning and end of this period took place on the tenth of the seventh month of Darius’ accession year and on the twenty-second of the eighth month of his first full regnal year. In this way I come back to the period as suggested by Hinz (1938:139-142), Olmstead (1948: 110ff.) and Kent (1953:160-163).

3. *The so-called ‘Rangaufstieg’ of Mâda*. In a comparatively recent article (Cl. Herrenschmidt 1976:59; 61)²¹, an old proposal by P.J. Junge (1941:10; *id.* 1942:9; 32-33, note 4) was revived concerning the changing position of the *dahyu* of *Mâda* (Media) in the ‘provincial lists’ of the Achaemenids. Junge and Herrenschmidt suggest that these changes reflect the growing importance of *Mâda* within the Achaemenid Empire. In this short note we want to show that this theory seems to be based on a wrong interpretation of the sources.

Herrenschmidt supports her theory by discussing the ‘provincial lists’ of three texts (in chronological order): DB, DPe and DNa²². In the DB list, the *dahyu* of *Mâda* occupies the tenth place; in the DPe list, the second; and in the DNa list, the first position. The ‘ascent’ of *Mâda* is subsequently taken to indicate the growing (political?) role of this *dahyu*. This is in spite of the fact that in other passages of the DB text, we often find the expression “*Pârsa, Mâda* and the other *dahyâva*” (paragraph 11; see also paragraphs 10; 12; 13; 14; sections 10-13)²³. However, there is another argument which seems to contradict

²⁰ It should be remarked, however, that the Akkadian version of the relevant passage in paragraph 15 is different; see Schmitt (1980:113).

²¹ Herrenschmidt’s proposals are followed by Calmeyer (1982:124; 1983:220).

²² For the DB, DPe and DNa lists, see Kent (1953).

²³ In sections 10 and 11 of the Akkadian version, (*Bâbirush*) is added to (*Pârsa*) and (*Mâda*); in section 10, at the second instance, both (*Bâbirush*) and (*Ûvja*) are added.

the hypothesis of Junge and others. This point is inherent in the lists themselves. To show this argument, it is necessary to examine the lists in greater detail. Apart from the 'provincial lists' in DB, DPe and DNa, we may also use those which are contained in the texts DSaa, DSe, XPh, DSm (in fragmentary state), and finally the list of delegates on the Darius statue from Susa²⁴. When studying all these texts together, it becomes apparent, as observed by many scholars before²⁵, that they are all, with the exception of the differing²⁶ XPh list, ordered according to a distinct pattern: the lists first mention the *dahyu/dahyâva* which is/are located in the heartland of the Empire (e.g. *Pârsa*, *Ûvja* and *Mâda*); this 'central group' is succeeded by the other *dahyâva*, which are arranged along lines which radiate from the centre to the four corners of the Empire (for further details, see section 4), in the extreme southwest, northwest, northeast and southeast. On the basis of this generalised pattern, the 'provincial lists' can be divided into two groups: the first sub-division (DB; DSaa; DSm(?); DPe) contains those lists in which the two western lines precede the lands of the east; in the second sub-division (DSe; DNa; Darius statue), this order is inverted, and the eastern lines precede the western²⁷. It appears as if in the first sub-division (which is probably the older of the two) the author was facing west, while in the second he was standing in a eastern direction. This may further be illustrated by the precedence of the southwestern line of *dahyâva* over the northwestern one, and of the northeastern line over the southeastern series. Whether facing east or west, in both cases the *dahyâva*

²⁴ For the DB, DPe, DSe, DNa and XPh texts, I refer to Kent (1953). For the Akkadian DSaa text, see Vallat (1971). For the fragmentary DSm text, see especially Brandenstein (1932:55-58). The statue of Darius from Susa is discussed in detail by Roaf (1974).

²⁵ Compare e.g. the schematic drawing of the DNa list by Goukowsky (1978:223), reproduced by Calmeyer (1982:113). However, it seems that the French scholar has refrained from studying the other lists; the southeastern line as envisaged by him extends from *Zranka*, via *Harauvatish*, *Thatagush* and *Gandâra* to *Hindush*, and is separated from the two *Sakâ* groups which according to Goukowsky symbolise the encircling, eastern peoples. This is not acceptable; in view of the other lists, we have to link *Gandâra* to the *Sakâ* groups, and together they represent the northeastern extreme of the Empire (see section 4).

²⁶ For a recent discussion of the XPh list, see Calmeyer (1982:129 ff.).

²⁷ Another difference between the two sub-divisions is the position of *Zranka*. In the first group, this *dahyu* is added to the northeastern line, while in the second group *Zranka* forms part of the southeastern series of lands.

on the left take precedence (compare the *pradakṣina* course, as it is called in the Indian cultural orbit). It is in this fact, that the key may lie to the correct understanding of the changing position of the *dahyu* of *Mâda*.

An important element within the context of the present study is the build-up of the 'central group'. We present the following table, indicating the position in the list of the relevant 'central' *dahyâva*.

Sub-division A, facing westward	DB	DSaa	DSm	DPe
<i>Pârsa</i>	1	1	(1)	–
<i>Mâda</i>	(10)	3	?	2
<i>Ûvja</i>	2	2	?	1
Sub-division B, facing eastward	DSe	DNa	Darius statue	
<i>Pârsa</i>	–	–	–	
<i>Mâda</i>	1	1	2	
<i>Ûvja</i>	2	2	3	

It may seem surprising that the *dahyu* of *Pârsa* is absent in certain of the lists; however, in these particular cases, *Pârsa* is mentioned in the text, prior to the 'provincial list'. This is apparently in order to underline the importance of this *dahyu*. The main point which becomes obvious when considering the above table, is the fact that *Ûvja* precedes *Mâda* in sub-division A, in those lists in which the author is facing westward; and that *Mâda* precedes *Ûvja* in sub-division B, when the author is facing eastward. When we take into consideration the actual geographical position of both *Ûvja* and *Mâda*, it becomes clear that the author has put himself in between, and enumerates, while dealing with the 'central group', firstly the main *dahyu* of the Empire, *Pârsa*, followed by the *dahyu* on his left hand side: when facing westward, this will be *Ûvja*; *Mâda* is mentioned second/third. Still facing westward, the southwestern line on the left hand side precedes the northwestern line on the right hand side. If the author is facing eastward, the *dahyu* of the 'central group' on the left hand side is *Mâda*; *Ûvja* follows as the second/third of the 'central lands'. And in this group, the northeastern line of *dahyâva* on the left hand side of the author precedes the southeastern lands. This arrangement can be compared to that which is represented in the army list of Xerxes, as transmitted by Herodotus (*Historiae* VII.61 ff.). This particular list first mentions the troops from the 'central lands', in this case Persia, Media, Elam, Hyrcania²⁸ and

²⁸ For a discussion of Hyrcania and its place in the army list of Herodotus, see Vogelsang, in press.

Assyria. Then follow the contingents from the eastern lands, succeeded by those from the western provinces of the Empire; and on either side, Herodotus appears first to mention the lands on the left hand side, then continues with those on the right. Again we notice that Media takes precedence over Elam, when the author is facing eastwards.

In conclusion, the changing positions of *Ūvja* and *Mâda* do not reflect a growing role of the Medes, at the cost of the people from *Ūvja*, but instead it indicates a change of orientation of the author. Whether this change reflects a development within the Achaemenid Empire remains unknown.

There still remains, however, the problem of the DB list, where *Mâda* is occupying the tenth place. The complete list is arranged as follows :

DB list (Old Persian version)

1. <i>Pârsa</i>	9. <i>Yauna</i>	17. <i>Bâkhtrish</i>
2. <i>Ūvja</i>	10. (<i>Mâda</i>)	18. (<i>Sug</i>) <i>uda</i>
3. (<i>B</i>) <i>âbirush</i>	11. <i>Armina</i>	19. <i>Gandâra</i>
4. <i>Athurâ</i>	12. <i>Katpatuka</i>	20. <i>Saka</i>
5. <i>Arabâya</i>	13. <i>Parthava</i>	21. <i>Thatagush</i>
6. <i>Mudrâya</i>	14. <i>Zranka</i>	22. <i>Haraumatish</i>
7. <i>tyaiy drayahyâ</i>	15. <i>Haraiva</i>	23. <i>Maka</i>

The above list can be split up in the following manner: *Pârsa* and *Ūvja* are usually regarded as the 'central' group (but see below); they are succeeded by the western lands, nos. 3-9. Then we read the name of *Mâda*, which precedes the two lands of *Armina* and *Katpatuka*. These two *dahyâva* normally form part of the western lands (the northwestern line). The lands given in nos. 13-23 are clearly the eastern lands. The correct understanding of this list may be found in studying the unusual positions of *Mâda*, *Armina* and *Katpatuka*. The combination of these three *dahyâva* seems to reflect conditions which were prevalent during the years of Median supremacy on the Iranian Plateau (and beyond)²⁹; the Median Empire included both *Armina* and *Katpatuka*, and an unknown area to the east of Media. The incorporation of *Armina* and *Katpatuka* into the Median Empire can also be related to the type of costume which is worn by the representatives from these two *dahyâva*,

²⁹ This point is discussed in detail by Calmeyer (1982: 124ff.).

as depicted on certain Achaemenid monuments³⁰: these officials wear the 'Medic' costume, consisting of a tunic, a *bashlyq*, and the combined trouser-boots/socks. In this way we may suggest that, in the DB list, *Mâda* heads a number of *dahyâva* which were originally linked to Media³¹; consequently we may perhaps suggest that the *dahyâva* of nos. 2-9 represent those lands which were never under (direct) Median control, but were added to the Empire by the Persians following their victory over the Medes. Continuing this theme we would therefore like to suggest, with due hesitation, that the 'central group' of the DB list consists of only one *dahyu*, *Pârsa*, while *Ûvja* heads the sequence of western lands; *Mâda* heads another sequence of *dahyâva*, namely those which were 'legitimately' incorporated into the Achaemenid Empire following the surrender of the Median king to the Achaemenid Cyrus.

As a conclusion we may state that the tenth place of *Mâda* in the DB list, far from indicating its minor role, seems to reflect its particular prominence, especially during the early years of the Persian Achaemenid Empire. Could we really expect otherwise?

4. *The unit of Gandâra and Saka/the Sakâ*. In the preceding section we have referred to the combination of *Armina* and *Katpatuka*, two *dahyâva* which are united in almost all of the extant Achaemenid 'provincial lists'. Similar units are also formed, for instance, by the *dahyâvas* of *Harauvatish* and *Thatagush*, with or without *Zranka*; *Parthava* and *Haraiva*, with or without *Zranka*, and *Bâkhtrish* and *Sug(u)da*, usually together with *Uvârazmî/Uvârazmish* (for a further discussion of these combinations, see Herrenschildt 1976:53ff.). Another 'eastern' combination of *dahyâva* seems to be *Gandâra* and *Saka/the Sakâ*. Because *dahyâva* units are usually made up of adjoining lands, the combination of the Indic land of *Gandâra* (which can be located in an area centred on modern Peshawar, in present day Pakistan) with the lands of the *Saka/the Sakâ* (which are generally located beyond the northern parts

³⁰ See for example the representatives from *Armina* and *Katpatuka* on the royal tombs at Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis (Schmidt 1970: Fig. 40).

³¹ Compare for example the report in the DB text Xparagraph 35-37/sections 28-30) which states that the 'rebels' in *Varkâna* and *Parthava* claimed to be adherents of *Fravartish*, the Median opponent of Darius.

of the Achaemenid Empire, in the steppes of Eurasia), seems surprising. The problem becomes more intriguing when one adds to this combination the *dahyu* of *Hindush*, an addition which seems to be indicated by certain 'provincial list' and which is accepted as such by a number of scholars (e.g. Herzfeld 1910:19; Herrenschildt 1976:56f.). In this note, I would like to discuss the combination of *Gandâra* and *Saka*/the *Sakâ*, and its relevance to the understanding of the Bisutun text; I would also like to refute the hypothesis that the *dahyu* of *Hindush* formed part of the same unit.

The answer to the problem of the combination of *Gandâra-Saka*/the *Sakâ* may lie in the particular character of the 'provincial lists'. As already discussed in section 3, the lists start with the 'central group', succeeded by the other *dahyâva*, which are normally listed along four lines which radiate from the centre of the Empire to its four corners. The *dahyâva* which are located at the extremes of the Persian state tend to occupy a special position in the lists; their importance is indicated by certain Achaemenid texts (DPh and DH)³², which describe the extent of the Empire: from the *Sakâ* beyond *Sugda* (in the extreme northeast) to *Kusha* (Sudan/Ethiopia in the extreme southwest), and from *Hindush* (the Lower Indus Valley in the extreme southeast³³) to *Sparda* (ancient Sardis in modern western Turkey). The same *Sakâ* beyond *Sugda* seems to be mentioned on the Darius statue from Susa (and possibly on other Achaemenid-Egyptian monuments)³⁴. Among the representatives who are depicted on the statue, these *Sakâ* form a separate combination with *Uvârazmîy*/*Uvârazmish* and together indicate the northeastern corner of the Empire. The interesting feature is that *Gandâra* is not mentioned on the statue, and that the unit of *Uvârazmîy*/*Uvârazmish* and these *Sakâ* occupies the place which is normally taken by the combination of *Gandâra* and *Saka*/the *Sakâ*. This leads us to the suggestion that the unit *Gandâra-Saka*/the *Sakâ*, just like *Uvârazmîy*/*Uvârazmish* and the *Sakâ* beyond *Sugda*, represents the extreme north-

³² For these texts, see Kent (1953).

³³ For a short discussion of the problem related to the precise location of the Achaemenid *dahyu* of *Hindush*, see Vogelsang (1985:81; 85).

³⁴ According to Ch. Krahmalkov and G. Hughes, in Cameron (1975:85-86).

eastern corner of the Empire. This point seems particularly evident when examining the DB list :

DB list, the eastern *dahyâva* :

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| 13. <i>Parthava</i> | 19. <i>Gandâra</i> |
| 14. <i>Zranka</i> | 20. <i>Saka</i> |
| 15. <i>Haraiva</i> | 21. <i>Thatagush</i> |
| 16. <i>Uvârazmîy</i> | 22. <i>Harauvatish</i> |
| 17. <i>Bâkhtrish</i> | 23. <i>Maka</i> |
| 18. <i>(Sug)uda</i> | |

The two groups of nos. 13-15 and 16-18 need no further discussion; the geographical location of these *dahyâva* along the northeastern line which radiates from the centre is clear. Equally evident is the approximate location of nos. 21-23. They belong to the southeastern part of the Empire, with *Maka* as its most extreme point³⁵. All that remains is the unit of *Gandâra-Saka*. As early as 1942, P.J. Junge (1942:11) had suggested that this combination should be joined to the preceding, northeastern groups. However, his proposals seem to have been generally ignored³⁶. Nevertheless, in the light of the above discussion, we would like to support Junge's hypothesis; and further to it, we would like to add that, within the specific character of the lists, this combination represents the northeastern extreme of the Empire. As for the *Saka*/the *Sakâ*, their link with the northeastern group is, geographically, unremarkable; regarding *Gandâra*, we should bear in mind the close relationship which seems to have existed between this (basically) Indic land south of the Hindu Kush mountains, and the Iranian lands of Classical Bactria to the north of this barrier³⁷. We may also point out that the Akkadian and Elamite versions of the DB list, instead of the (Indic) name of *Gandâra* which is used in the Old Persian, read the (Iranian) name of (Akk.) KUR *Pa-ar-û-pa-ra-e-sa-an-na*, which can (approximately) be translated as '(the land) beyond (the land) above the eagle'³⁸. This name was apparently given to the region by people living, or coming from north of the Hindu Kush, i.e. from ancient Bactria. In conclusion, we would

³⁵ It seems likely that the sequence *Thatagush-Harauvatish* should be inverted; see a similar ordering on the Darius statue from Susa.

³⁶ With the exception of Calmeyer (1982:126-128), who briefly suggests a similar ordering.

³⁷ For the links between Bactria and India, see Briant (1984:65ff.) and Witzel (1980).

³⁸ Compare Witzel (1980:117, note 104).

like to suggest that the northeastern line of *dahyâva*, as enumerated in the DB list, is grouped as follows :

'Near' Northeast	'Middle' Northeast	'Far' Northeast ³⁹
13. <i>Parthava</i>	16. <i>Uvârazmîy</i>	19. <i>Gandâra</i>
14. <i>Zranka</i>	17. <i>Bâkhtrish</i>	20. <i>Saka</i>
15. <i>Haraiva</i>	18. <i>(Sug)uda</i>	

We now come to the question whether the *dahyu* of *Hindush* should be associated with the unit *Gandâra-Saka*/the *Sakâ*. In the light of the above discussion, in which we tried to show that *Hindush* was regarded as a southeastern extreme, and the combination *Gandâra-Saka*/the *Sakâ* as the northeastern corner of the Empire, the association of both extremes seems unlikely. However, two 'provincial lists', contained in the texts DSe and DNa, seem to indicate such a combination. *Hindush* is placed between the *Maciyâ* (*Maka*) and *Gandâra* on the one side, and two groups of the *Sakâ* on the other. Yet, it seems to us that the sequence *Gandâra-Hindush* should be inverted, thus linking *Hindush* to *Maka* and *Gandâra* to the *Sakâ*. Such an inversion is very common in the 'provincial lists', compare the sequence (*Harauvatish*)-(Zranka)-(Thatagush) on the Darius statue from Susa. To support this hypothesis, it may be pointed out that the two *dahyâva* of (*Maka*) and (*Hindush*) on the Darius statue form a distinct unit, clearly indicating the southeastern extreme of the Empire.

REFERENCES

- BORGER, R., 1982, *Die Chronologie des Darius-Denkmal am Behistun-Felsen*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1. Philologisch- Historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1982, Nr. 3).
- BORGER, R. and W. HINZ, 1984, Die Behistun-Inschrift Darius des Grossen, in : *Texte der Umwelt des Alten Testaments*. Band I, Lief. 4. Ed. O. Kaiser. Gütersloh. (pp. 419-450).
- BRANDENSTEIN, W., 1932, Die neuen Achämenideninschriften. *WZKM*, 39, pp. 7-97.
- BRIANT, P., 1984, *L'Asie centrale et les royaumes proche-orientaux du premier millénaire (c. VIII^e-IV^e siècles avant notre ère)*. Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, Mémoire, no. 1. Paris.
- CALMEYER, P., 1972-1976, s.v. 'Hose', in : *RLA*, IV, pp. 472-476.
- idem*, 1982, Zur Genese altiranischer Motive, VII: Die "statistische Landkarte des Perserreiches"-I. *AMI*, N.F., 15, pp. 105-187.

³⁹ The unit of *Gandâra-Saka*/the *Sakâ*, as reflected in the Achaemenid 'provincial lists', may shed some light on the πόλις Γανδαρική, Σκυθῶν δὲ ἄκτῃ. of Hecataeus (fragment 179). This point should be added to the recent study on the subject by Daffinà (1980).

- idem*, 1983, Zur Genese altiranischer Motive, VII: Die "statistische Landcharte des Perserreiches"-II. *AMI*, N.F., 16, pp. 141-222.
- CAMERON, G.G., 1975, Darius the Great and his Scythian (Saka) Campaign. Bisutun and Herodotus. *Acta Iranica*, 4, (second series, I), pp. 77-88.
- COOK, J.M., 1983, *The Persian Empire*. London, Melbourne. Toronto.
- DAFFINÀ, P. 1980, On Kaspetyros and the so-called 'Shore of the Scythians', *AAH*, 28, pp. 1-8. Also published in: *From Hecataeus to Al-Huwârizmî*, etc. Ed. J. Harmatta. Budapest, 1984, pp. 1-8.
- DANDAMAJEV, M., 1976, *Persien unter den ersten Achämeniden*. Translated by H.-D. Pohl. Wiesbaden.
- GOUKOWSKY, P., 1978, *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre I*. Nancy.
- GREENFIELD, J.C. and B. PORTEN, 1982, *The Bisutun Inscription of Darius the Great. Aramaic Version. Text, Translation and Commentary*. (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part 1: Inscriptions of Ancient Iran. Vol. V: The Aramaic Versions of the Achaemenian Inscriptions, etc. Texts 1). London.
- HALLOCK, R.T., 1960, The 'One Year' of Darius. *JNES*, XIX, pp. 36-39.
- HERRENSCHMIDT, Cl. 1976, Désignation de l'empire et concepts politiques de Darius I^{er} d'après ses inscriptions en Vieux-Perse. *Studia Iranica*, 5, fasc. 1, pp. 33-65.
- HINZ, W., 1938, Das erste Jahr des grosskönigs Dareios. *ZDMG*, 92, pp. 136-173.
- idem*, 1942, Zur Behistun-Inschrift des Dareios. *ZDMG*, 96, pp. 326-349.
- idem*, 1974, Die Behistan-Inschrift des Darius in ihrer ursprünglicher Fassung. *AMI*, N.F., 7, pp. 121-134.
- idem*, 1976, *Darius und die Perser. Eine Kulturgeschichte der Achämeniden*. Vol. I. Baden-Baden.
- JUNGE, P.J., 1941, Saka-Studien. *Klio*, Beiheft 41. Leipzig.
- idem*, 1942, Satrapie und Natio. Reichsverwaltung und Reichspolitik im Staate Dareios' I. *Klio*, N.F., XVI (= XXXIV), pp. 1-55.
- idem*, 1944, *Dareios I. König der Perser*. Leipzig.
- KENT, R.G., 1953, *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. Second, and revised edition. New Haven.
- LOON, M.N. van, 1966, Urartian Art. Its Distinctive Traits in the Light of New Excavations. Istanbul.
- LUSCHEY, H. 1968, Studien zu dem Darius-Relief von Bisutun. *AMI*, N.F., 1, pp. 63-94.
- NAGEL, W., 1983, Frada, Skuncha und der Saken-Feldzug des Darius I, in: *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben*. Eds. H. Koch and D.N. Mackenzie (= *AMI*, Erg. Bd. X), pp. 169-189.
- OLMSTEAD, A.T., 1948, *History of the Persian Empire*. Chicago.
- PARKER, R.A., and DUBBERSTEIN, W.H., 1956, *Babylonian Chronology (626 B.C.-A.D. 75)*, Providence.
- POEBEL, A., 1938a, The names and the order of the Old Persian and Elamite months during the Achaemenian period. *AJSLL*, 55, pp. 130-141.
- idem*, 1938b, Chronology of Darius' First Year of Reign. *AJSLL*, LV, pp. 142-165 and 285-314.
- idem*, 1939, The Duration of the Reign of Smerdis, the Magian and the Reigns of Nebuchadnezzar III, and Nebuchadnezzar IV. *AJSLL*, LVI, pp. 121-145.
- ROAF, M. 1974, The Subject-Peoples on the Base of the Statue of Darius. *Cahiers DAFI*, 4, pp. 73-160.
- SARRE, F. and E. HERZFELD, 1910, *Iranische Felsreliefs. Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen von Denkmälern aus alt- und mitteliranischer Zeit*. Berlin.

- SCHMITT, R., 1980, Zur babylonischen Version der Bisûtun-Inschrift, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, XXVII, pp. 106-126.
- SCHMIDT, E.F., 1970, *Persepolis III*. Oriental Institute Publications, LXX. Chicago.
- SHAHBAZI, A.Sh., 1972, The 'One Year' of Darius Re-Examined. *BSOAS*, 35, pp. 609-614.
- TRÜMPELMANN, L., 1967, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Monumentes Dareios' I von Bisutun und zur Datierung der Einführung der altpersischen Schrift. *AA*, 1967/3, pp. 281-298.
- VALLAT, F., 1971, Deux nouvelles 'Chartes de Fondation' d'un palais de Darius I^{er} à Suse. *Syria*, XLVIII, 1-2, pp. 53-59.
- VOGELSANG, W., 1985, Early Historical Arachosia in South-East Afghanistan. Meeting-place between East and West. *IrAnt*, XX, pp. 55-99.
- idem*, forthcoming, Some Observations on ancient Hyrcania. A Combination of Sources. Paper presented to the Fifth Achaemenid Workshop, London, 1985.
- VOIGTLANDER, E.N. Von, 1978, *The Behistun Inscription of Darius the Great, Babylonian Version*. Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Part 1 : Inscriptions of Ancient Iran. Vol. II : The Babylonian Versions of the Achaemenian Inscriptions. Text I. London.
- WEISSBACH, F. H., 1911, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*. Leipzig.
- WITZEL, H., 1980, Early Eastern Iran and the Atharvaveda. *Persica*, IX, pp. 86-128.